

PARKS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 8, 2008

MINUTES

1. Call to Order – 8:30 am by Marilyn Wilkinson
2. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS ON ANY ITEM NOT ON TODAY'S AGENDA
 - John Degenfelder – We have 5 schools in Ramona that are participating in the design contest for a trails logo. I will be sending out information to the group in the near future.
 - Jim Peugh – I was just wondering if there was an update on the park in Julian.
 - ♦ Renee Bahl - The Board of Supervisors authorized a second ballot and these ballots should be mailed out today, so the residents should start to receive them on Monday. Then they have until the close of the Board of Supervisors meeting on March 26 to turn in their vote and then it will take about a week to tally the votes, which will be done by an outside firm. The results will then be read at the Board of Supervisors meeting on April 9th.
 - Paul Davis – I was talking to Mark Massen before the meeting about the Lindo Lake and am keeping up-to-date on this project.
3. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 11, 2008 MINUTES
 - Approval of January 11, 2008 Minutes
MOTION TO APPROVE JANUARY 11, 2008 – Doug Goad, 2nd Rod Groenewold
ALL IN FAVOR – 8-0-0
4. DEPARTMENT REPORT – Sean O'Neill
 - Distributed the January accomplishments.
 - We had the groundbreaking for Hilton Head Phase II, which will include the first park in the County system with water features.
 - Just a reminder that we are having our Annual Awards Ceremony, on February 14, 2008 at the Fallbrook Community Center and we invite and hope you all will come and join us. The ceremony will be at 10:00 am and then there will be lunch served.
 - Our March 14th meeting will be a site visit to the Ramona Grasslands. We will be sending out detailed information and map/directions.
5. PLDO and CSA Fund Balance Reports – Melissa Lowrey
 - Distributed the PLDO and CSA reports.
 - Distributed example of new PLDO report format for review.
 - We are going to be meeting with the different planning groups and areas to get their feedback and input on this new format to make sure that it is in a format that they can easily understand and is user friendly for their purposes.
 - ♦ John Degenfelder – How often is this updated?
 - We update the reports monthly and distribute those updates to this group each month. As for the planning groups we usually only meet with them a couple of times a month. This as always depends on how much work is being done in the area/region.

6. NORTH COUNTY MSCP REVIEW – Maeve Hanley

- This item was presented at the January meeting and has been added to this agenda for follow-up.
- Volume 2 is the conservation analysis, which will lists the vegetation types, species and how the measures in the North County MSCP will help to preserve these species.
 - ♦ Paul Davis – I think that we should be working with the Agricultural Department on this as well, because there is a connection between the two types of use and there is also money out there that we might be able to use.
- The Farm Bureau was one of the stakeholders at the meetings and we have been working with them on this plan. There are definite incentives for agriculture lands and we are using all resources in this plan.
- Jim Peugh – Are you including the flora in the review of how the agriculture affects the area?
- These are more extensive instead of intensive agricultural lands, such as avocado groves and grazing.
 - ♦ Marilyn Wilkinson – When we receive property or mitigation lands for some type of construction are we trying to get land in these preserve areas to help expand the preserve areas?
- There are some requirements for federal and state acquisitions, however unlike the south county MSCP there is not a refuge in this area, so there may be different support from the federal government to give money for the purchase of an acquisition instead of purchasing it themselves. Yes, we are always trying to support the MSCP with acquisitions from mitigation.
 - ♦ Jim Peugh – I know that there is still land in the south county that the federal government is supposed to purchase, will the implementation of this land slow down or stop the movement of the south county MSCP?
- No, the south county MSCP should not be affected by the planning and implementation of the North County MSCP.
 - ♦ Mike McCoy – I sent two letters to this group about the Off-Road racing events that occurred in the Otay Valley Regional Park and are once again coming up again for a permit in the area. The first permit was approved by the City of Chula Vista, which brings up how important it is to have standardization of the MSCP concepts and area. The Otay Valley Concept Plan is being violated and it seems that we go through all of this work to put together these plans and policies and then it just starts falling apart. There were a lot of people that worked to try and protect and preserve these lands and now it seems that when it is even more important to protect the animals and habitat we are continuing to see more modifications, exceptions and allowances to the areas and rules. The various cities and agencies that own and manage land within these preserve areas should be held accountable for their actions and required to follow the rules and regulations set-forth for the area.
 - ♦ Marilyn Wilkinson – What would you like this committee to do on this issue?
 - ♦ Mike McCoy - I think that we should move through this committee and SANDAG to move it forward to standardize it throughout the County. I was going to bring a woman today from SANDAG to talk about these issues and if it is ok with this committee I would like to bring Crystal Crawford to a future meeting to speak about this issue.

- ◆ Doug Goad – As I understand it the MSCP is a broad based plan/agreement and that these plans are pretty good and that we just need to implement and enforce the plans that are already there.
- ◆ Mike McCoy – Yes, it does no good to have all of these plans if each of the various cities and/or agencies can override it at will.
- The areas are under Section 10 permits which are give out from the state, so there are rules that have to be followed but the State would have to enforce the violations.
 - ◆ Jim Peugh – that sounds good, but there are a lot of plans that were supposed to be completed and haven't been and there has yet to be a permit revoked.
 - ◆ Marilyn Wilkinson – I would like to make a suggestion that we give Dr. McCoy our contact information and he can be the source for this group and keep us up-to-date on what is happening with this issue.
 - ◆ Mike McCoy – Can we put this on the agenda for April and I will bring Crystal Crawford from SANDAG?
 - ◆ Marilyn Wilkinson – I think that this is something that we should address and will be the focus of our April meeting.

7. NEW PROPOSED FEES – Matt Bohan

- In 2001 we went to the Board of Supervisors to get an approved fee range, which was approved. The current range is anywhere from \$6 - \$25 and included the authority for the Parks Director to adjust the fees within this range.
- We are currently at the top of this range for most of our fees and it is time to start working to once again adjust our fee range.
- We would like to work through this committee once again to assist us with the development of these new fees and support in our process.
 - ◆ Marilyn – I think that this is definitely something that we need to look at, but I want to make sure that we are taking into account the current financial status of the County and that we want to keep people outside and at our parks.
 - ◆ Doug Goad – I think that it is a very difficult place for the County to have to balance the space and community needs with the financial needs of the community as well.
 - ◆ Jim Peugh – I think that last time there was a pretty extensive study done of the fees in surrounding areas, is there going to be something like this done this time.
- Yes, actually we have already began preparing and putting this information together and will be bringing this information to the group.
- We will be putting this on the April agenda and will have all of our research and proposal for the group, we just wanted to bring it up today to give you advance notification that this is something we are doing and will be working with this group on.

8. HEISE VEGETATIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN – Mike McFedries

- Distributed summary of the Heise Vegetative Management Plan.
- The main goal of the project is to have a plan that will allow a fire to go through the area that is not devastating to the entire area and does not promote the uncontrollable fast moving fires that we have experienced in the County in the last 10 years.

- We have already started working to remove some of the dead trees and fuel on the ground. The removal of these dead trees and fuel allows a fire to follow its normal progression without the extra fuel.
- We are going to continue this management plan to Santa Ysabel and other areas as well and currently are planning. However, we are figuring it will take about 3 years for this current project.
 - ♦ Marilyn – The fire safe council is going to be getting millions in federal money from the recent fires and I think that we should be working with them on a joint effort to see if there is any additional funding we may be able to get.
 - ♦ Jim Peugh – Are you doing any biological monitoring to see how it is affecting the area? There are a lot of biological resources in dead wood and the ecological system many times depends on the natural progression of the forest, which includes the benefits of the dead wood on the ground.
- We have done some biological surveys, but since we just started the removal process and will do more surveys after we start to see some of the seasons go through the area. We are using about an 8 to 10 ratio of downed and dead trees.
 - ♦ Roger Utt – Can you describe what the safe barrier is that you will be creating. How do you implement this plan throughout the park?
- It is very hard to describe because we are not putting a barrier or big fire break around the park, but are just thinning out some of the depth and continuity of areas to give a fire less fuel and a slower pace or movement of the fires progression. We started with the campground area for safety reason and then we have divided the park into quadrants and are working in quadrants throughout the park. This is about a 1,000 acre park, so it will be a process.
 - ♦ Jim – I think that there are a lot of misconceptions about how to manage the fuel load from a biological standpoint.
 - ♦ Marilyn Wilkinson – Are there plans for more of these plans and do we have funding for them?
- We were more passive in the past and then the Cedar fire made us more proactive and also gave us funding to assist with the planning and implementation of this type of project and we will continue to try and find the funding for future plans.

9. Opportunity for Members of Public to Speak on Any Items Not on Today's Agenda

- None

10. Adjournment at 9:50 am

ATTENDEES:

Mike McCoy, District 1
 Marilyn Wilkinson, District 2
 John Degenfelder, District 2
 Doug Goad, District 3
 Paul Davis, District 3
 Jim Peugh, District 4
 Roger Utt, District 4
 Rod Groenewold, District 5
 Renée E. Bahl, County of San Diego Parks and Recreation

Sean O'Neill, County of San Diego Parks and Recreation
Sabrina Hicks, County of San Diego Parks and Recreation
Melissa Lowrey, County of San Diego Parks and Recreation
Maeve Hanley, County of San Diego Parks and Recreation
Mike McFedries, County of San Diego Parks and Recreation
Matt Bohan, County of San Diego Parks and Recreation